IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA Richmond Division

ePLUS, INC.,)
Plaintiff,))
v.) Civil Action No. 3:09-cv-620
LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC.)
Defendant.)))

<u>DEFENDANT LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC.'S OBJECTIONS TO PLAINTIFF'S</u> <u>DESIGNATED DISCOVERY FOR CONTEMPT PROCEEDINGS</u>

Pursuant to the Scheduling Order entered on November 23, 2011 and the parties' Stipulated Order regarding Briefing Schedule, attached hereto are Defendant Lawson Software Inc.'s Objections to Plaintiff ePlus Inc.'s Designations of Deposition Testimony for the contempt proceeding from the following witnesses:

Dale A. Christopherson Todd Dooner Dean Hager Scott Hanson Elizabeth Homewood Keith Lohkamp Kurt Reasoner Kevin Samuelson

LAWSON SOFTWARE, INC.

By /s/ Of Counsel Dabney J. Carr, IV, VSB #28679 Robert A. Angle, VSB #37691 TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP

P. O. Box 1122

Richmond, Virginia 23218-1122 Telephone: (804) 697-1200 Facsimile: (804) 697-1339

dabney.carr@troutmansanders.com robert.angle@troutmansanders.com

Josh A. Krevitt (admitted pro hac vice) Daniel J. Thomasch (admitted *pro hac vice*) Christopher D. Dusseault (admitted *pro hac vice*) Jason C. Lo (admitted *pro hac vice*) GIBSON, DUNN & CRUTCHER LLP

New York, NY 10166-0193 Telephone: (212) 351-4000 Facsimile: (212) 351-4035

200 Park Avenue

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on this 20th day of February, 2012, a true copy of the foregoing will be filed electronically with the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system, which will send a notification of such filing (NEF) to the following:

Craig T. Merritt
Henry I. Willett, III
CHRISTIAN & BARTON, LLP
909 East Main Street, Suite 1200
Richmond, Virginia 23219-3095
cmerritt@cblaw.com
hwillett@cblaw.com

Scott L. Robertson
Jennifer A. Albert
David M. Young (VSB No. 35997)
Goodwin Procter, LLP
901 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, DC 20001
srobertson@goodwinprocter.com
jalbert@goodwinprocter.com
dyoung@goodwinprocter.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

James D. Clements Goodwin Procter, LLP Exchange Place 53 State Street Boston, MA 02109-2881 jclements@goodwinprocter.com

 $/_{\rm S}/$

Dabney J. Carr, IV (VSB No. 28679) Robert A. Angle (VSB No. 37691) Megan C. Rahman (VSB No. 42678) dabney.carr@troutmansanders.com robert.angle@troutmansanders.com megan.rahman@troutmansanders.com

TROUTMAN SANDERS LLP

1001 Haxall Point Richmond, VA 23219 Telephone: (804) 697-1200 Facsimile: (804) 697-1339

Counsel for Defendant Lawson Software, Inc.

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
54:18-19	401, 402, 602, 801, 802, 901.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Question does not describe source code. Internal layperson analysis of patent claims is irrelevant to both prongs of <i>TiVo</i> . Witness had no recollection of the document. Hearsay.
62:1-2	401, 402, 602, 611, 701, 801, 802.	Witness' opinion is irrelevant and improper testimony. Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Vague and ambiguous as to "accurate or inaccurate". Hearsay.
62:14-15; 62:20-21	401, 402, 602, 611, 801, 802.	Vague as to "error". Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Questions do not describe source code. Witness' opinion as to draft flow charts is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> . Questions call for hearsay.
65:17-18	401, 402, 602, 611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Question does not describe source code. Vague as to "developed the code". When witness created slides is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> . Hearsay.
71:12	401, 402, 602, 611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Question does not describe source code. Question calls for speculation. Hearsay.
79:6-7	401, 402, 602, 611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Question does not describe source code. Vague as to "design spec". Hearsay.
84:14-15; 84:19-22	602, 613, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Questions do not describe source code. Examiner is simply reading documents into the transcript. Questions call for hearsay.
86:16-19	401, 402, 611.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Question does not describe source code. Vague as to "process of assigning the number itself".
93:5-8	401, 402, 602, 611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Question does not describe source code. Timing of code changes is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> . Question is

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
		vague as to "changes" and when those changes were "released". Hearsay.
96:2-5; 96:7-9; 96:11-13; 96:15-16; 96:18-22	602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Questions do not describe source code. Questions call for hearsay.
131:3-8; 131:10; 131:13- 14; 131:16-17;	602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Questions do not describe source code. Questions call for hearsay.
131:19-22; 132:3	602, 611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Questions do not describe source code. Calls for speculation. Calls for speculation as to how IDs are stored. Vague as to "associated". Questions call for hearsay.
172:10-14; 172:18; 173:3- 5; 173:7-8; 173:10-11; 173:13-14; 173:16-17; 173:19; 173:21- 22; 174:2; 174:4-5; 174:8; 174:11; 174:13- 14; 174:16-20; 174:22; 175:4- 5; 175:7-10; 175:13-14; 175:18-19; 175:22; 176:2- 4; 176:6-9; 176:11-13; 176:16-18; 176:20-21	401, 402.	ePlus never unequivocally accused the CartObject of infringing at trial, and therefore it is irrelevant under either prong of <i>TiVo</i> .
183:12; 183:22- 184:2; 184:4-5; 184:8; 184:10- 11; 184:15; 185:17-18: 185:8-9; 185:12-13; 195:16-18;	401, 402.	ePlus never unequivocally accused the cookie file of infringing at trial, and therefore it is irrelevant under either prong of <i>TiVo</i> .

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated Testimony		
185:20; 185:22;		
186:3-6; 186:8;		
186:12-14;		
186:16-19;		
186:22-187:3;		
187:16-17;		
187:19; 187:21-		
188:2; 188:5; 188:10		
197:6-9; 197:11	602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation. Question does not describe
		source code. Hearsay.
197:14-16	602, 701, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation. Question does not describe
		source code. Question is not relevant to
		either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test. Calls for a legal
		conclusion as to what constitutes an order list. Vague as to "official record" and "order
		list".
199:2-6	801, 802	ePlus never accused the cookie file or the
		cart object of infringing at trial, and
		therefore it is not relevant to either prong of
		the TiVo test. Hearsay.
199:12-14	611, 613.	Vague as to timing, copies, and list.
200.2 5. 200.0	401 402 901 902	Misstates the witness' testimony.
200:2-5; 200:9-	401, 402, 801, 802.	Vague as to "temporary list" and "reflected". ePlus never accused the cookie file of
10		infringing at trial, and therefore it is not
		relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
		Hearsay.
200:21-201:1	401, 402, 613, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation. Question does not describe
		source code. ePlus never accused the cookie
		file of infringing at trial, and therefore it is
		not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
201:7-9	401, 402, 801, 802.	Hearsay. Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
201.7-9	701, 402, 001, 002.	designation. Question does not describe
		source code. Irrelevant to <i>TiVo</i> test.
201:14	602, 611, 801, 802.	Vague as to "it". Outside the scope of the
		30(b)(6) designation. Question does not
		describe source code.
201:18	611.	Not a question.

Plaintiff's Designated	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Testimony 205:19-20; 205:22-206:1; 206:3-4; 206:7- 9; 206:11-13; 206:15-16; 206:18-21;	401, 402.	ePlus never accused errors or error-checking process of infringing at trial, and therefore both are not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
207:1-2 209:16-18	401, 402.	Process of adding items to cookie file has not changed, and ePlus never accused the cookie file of infringing, therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
210:13-14; 210:16-17; 210:20-22; 210: 211:2-4; 211:6- 7; 211:9-11	401, 402.	ePlus never accused errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the questions are not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
211:13-17	611.	Vague as to "works".
212:9-11; 212:13; 212:15- 20; 212:22- 213:1; 213:3-8	401, 402.	ePlus never accused errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the questions are not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
213:10-14	401, 402, 611.	Vague as to "result" and as to what the user has. ePlus never accused errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
213:20-214:2; 214:4-6	401, 402, 611.	Vague as to "result". ePlus never accused errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the questions are not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
214:9-11	401, 402, 611.	Vague as to "look the same". ePlus never accused errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated		
Testimony		
214:14; 214:16;	401, 402, 611.	ePlus never accused errors of infringing at
214:18-19;	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	trial, and therefore the questions are not
214:21-215:2;		relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
215:4; 215:6;		Total want to entire prong of 177 o teem
215:8-9;		
215:11-13;		
215:15-17;		
215:19-20;		
215:22-216:6;		
216:9		
216:15-18;	401, 402, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
216:20; 216:22-	101, 102, 001, 002.	designation. Questions do not describe
217:1; 217:3-4;		source code. Change in error processing is
217:6-7; 217:9-		not relevant to changes alleged as basis for
10; 217:12-13;		design-around, and therefore is not relevant
217:15-18;		to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test. Hearsay.
220:13-14;		to entire preng of the extent from the
220:16-18;		
220:20-221:3		
237:7-8	401, 402.	ePlus never accused errors of infringing at trial, and similarities cannot be focus of inquiry, therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
245:10-13;	401, 402.	ePlus never accused cookie file or errors of
245:17-21		infringing at trial, and therefore the
		questions are not relevant to either prong of
		TiVo test.
246:2-3	401, 402, 611.	Vague as to "they're". ePlus never accused
		cookie file of infringing at trial, and
		therefore the question is not relevant to
		either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
246:11-14;	801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
246:16-18;		designation. Questions do not describe
246:20-247:1;		source code. Hearsay.
247:3; 247:5;		
247:7-10;		
247:12-15;		
247:17-19;		
247:21-248:2;		
248:4; 248:6-9;		
248:16		

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated Testimony		
248:11-13	611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Question does not describe source code. Vague as to "behavior." Hearsay
248:22-249:7; 248:9-11	801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Questions do not describe source code. Hearsay.
248:22-249:7; 249:9-11	801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Questions do not describe source code. Hearsay.
251:4-5	401, 402, 611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Question does not describe source code. Vague as to "parallel." Ability to run RQC and RSS simultaneously is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test. Hearsay.
251:13-14; 251:16-18	401, 402.	ePlus never accused cookie file or errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the questions are not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
251:20-21	401, 402, 611.	ePlus never accused cookie file or errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test Vague as to "how long is it going to stay?"
252:5-6	401, 402, 611.	ePlus never accused cookie file or errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.
252:8-9	401, 402, 611.	ePlus never accused cookie file or errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test. Vague as to "fix".
252:12-18	401, 402, 801, 802.	ePlus never accused errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test. Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation. Question does not describe source code. Hearsay.
252:20-21	401, 402.	ePlus never accused cookie file or errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.

Case 3:09-cv-00620-REP Document 910 Filed 02/20/12 Page 10 of 37 PageID# 29662

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated		
Testimony		
253:2-3	401, 402.	ePlus never accused cookie file or errors of infringing at trial, and therefore the question is not relevant to either prong of <i>TiVo</i> test.

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
30:17-20	401, 402.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> .
30:22-31:2	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "necessitate any modifications."
31:6-8	401, 402, 611, 701	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Calls for a legal conclusion; vague and ambiguous as to "require that any modifications be made."
31:16-18	401, 402, 611, 701.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Calls for legal conclusion; vague and ambiguous as to "require any changes be made."
32:1-4; 32:22-33:2	401, 402, 701.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Calls for legal conclusion.
32:6-7; 32:11-14; 32:18-20; 36:3-7; 36:9-12; 37:20-38:1; 38:4-8; 40:7-9; 40:11-13; 41:7-9; 41:11-13; 41:15-18; 42:3-5; 42:10-12; 47:5-7; 47:18-20; 51:11-14; 52:21-53:2; 53:10-13; 58:9; 58:21-59:1; 62:16-18; 63:11-13; 235:22-236:3; 236:7-8; 236:10-11; 236:13-14; 236:18-21; 237:8-10; 237:12-14; 237:16-18; 237:20-238:1; 238:3-5; 243:13-17; 252:7-10; 267:16-20; 268:4-7; 282:6-8; 285:17-22; 293:12-13; 294:2- 295:3; 295:19-22; 296:6-8; 296:10-17; 296:19-22; 297:20- 298:1; 298:7-9; 307:19- 21; 308:1-2; 308:8-10; 334:12-15; 334:18-20; 335:2-5; 335:9-10; 335:19-336:2; 366:17- 20; 367:6-7; 367:10; 381:8	401, 402	Irrelevant in light of TiVo.
33:4-7	401, 402, 611, 701.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Calls for opinion; Vague and

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
		ambiguous as to "punchout setup request."
33:11-13	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "punchout setup response."
35:11-17	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "process for Punchout setup request and Punchout set up response."
36:14	Improper designation	Part of question and complete answer omitted from designation.
38:10-13	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "placed in the items list in the user interface."
44:16-18	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "Punchout process."
47:9-10	401, 402, 701 701.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Calls for opinion.
47:12-14	401, 402, 611, 701.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; vague and ambiguous as to "changes needed"; Calls for opinion.
55:14; 56:5-6; 56:20- 57:1; 196:12-21	802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to discuss webinars presented to customers regarding RQC.
91:8-9	611, 701.	Vague and ambiguous as to "screen display showing multiple product catalogs"; Calls for opinion.
92:8-9	611, 701.	Vague and ambiguous as to "punch out to the Dell catalog"; Calls for opinion.
92:17-19	611, 701.	Vague and ambiguous as to "select either the Dell catalogue or the Staples catalogue to search"; Misstates prior testimony; Calls for opinion.
93:13-14	701.	Calls for opinion.
93:19-22	Improper designation, 611, 701.	Fails to designate the entire question; Vague as to "brought back into the item lines list"; Calls for opinion.
94:7-9	611, 701.	Vague and ambiguous as to "using the data relating to those selected items"; Calls for opinion.

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
94:14-17	611, 701.	Vague and ambiguous as to "process that requisition"; Calls for opinion.
133:6-7	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "stage."
210:4-8	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "backwards to the requisition module functionality."
210:12-15	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "back to prior functionality."
221:7-14	401, 402, 611, 701, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to actual changes Lawson implemented; Mischaracterizes document; Calls for opinion; Hearsay.
222:21-223:1	401, 402, 701.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Calls for opinion.
223:6-9	401, 402, 701.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Calls for opinion.
224:3-13	401, 402, 611, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to actual changes Lawson implemented; Vague and ambiguous as to "functionality of searching for items"; Hearsay.
224:18-20	401, 402, 611, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to actual changes Lawson implemented; Vague and ambiguous as to "unacceptable to remove the search capabilities"; Hearsay.
225:21-226:1; 226:17- 227:5	401, 402, 611, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to actual changes Lawson implemented; Vague and ambiguous as to "ultimately agree"; Hearsay.

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
226:5-7; 227:9-11	401, 402, 611, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to actual changes Lawson implemented; Vague and ambiguous as to "unacceptable"; Hearsay.
231:8-10; 231:22-232:3	701, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to actual changes Lawson implemented; Calls for opinion; Hearsay.
235:12-18	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "add selected items from among the items in search results to a list of items being built on the righthand side of the user interface."
237:1-4	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "list of items that's being built on that side of the user interface."
238:7-10	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "list of selected items being built on the right-hand side of the user interface."
238:14-16	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "releases the requisition."
238:20-22	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "releases the requisition."
239:21-240:2 241:7-9	611. 401, 402, 611.	Misstates prior testimony. Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "innovations."
242:14-20	611.	Misstates document.
243:20-21	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "that still happens."
249:14-17	701, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify regarding Lawson's outreach efforts to customers; Calls for speculation; Hearsay.

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
249:22-250:3	401, 402, 611, 701, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify regarding Lawson's outreach efforts to customers; Argumentative; Calls for speculation; Calls for opinion; Hearsay.
250:8-9	401, 402, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to actual changes Lawson implemented; Hearsay.
250:14-16	401, 402, 611, 701, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify regarding Lawson's outreach efforts to customers; Calls for speculation; Argumentative; Hearsay.
269:1-3	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "associated with multiple vendors."
276:4-9; 278:20-279:2 277:6-10; 279:16-17	611. 401, 402, 801, 802.	Incomplete hypothetical Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to his personal opinion as to whether a change renders RQC noninfringing; Hearsay.
279:7-9	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "innovative."
280:4-7	401, 402, 611, 701, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside of the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to give a legal opinion as to whether a change is obvious; Vague and ambiguous as to "obvious"; Calls for opinion; Hearsay.
287:4-8	401, 402, Improper designation.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; answer not designated.
292:16-22	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "this functionality."

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
295:14-15	401, 402, 611.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Vague and ambiguous as to "associated with."
298:19-299:1	611, 701.	Vague and ambiguous as to "catalog"; Calls for opinion.
300:17-20	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "items being built in this RQC user interface."
305:7-10	701, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify regarding his own opinion as to whether a specific feature infringes; Calls for opinion; Hearsay.
306:7-10	611.	Misstates document.
308:13-15	611, 701.	Misstates testimony; Calls for opinion.
317:20-318:8; 319:3-5	611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Questions do not relate to the actual changes implemented; Misstates document; Hearsay.
318:17-19; 330:2-6; 336:4; 389:4; 392:10- 14; 396:13-15; 426:11- 12	801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Questions do not relate to the actual changes implemented; Hearsay
319:10-13	611, 701, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Questions do not relate to the actual changes implemented; Argumentative; Calls for Opinion; Hearsay.
319:19-320:2	601, 611, 701, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Questions do not relate to the actual changes implemented; Calls for speculation; Argumentative; Calls for opinion; Hearsay.
320:16-19	602, 611, 801, 802, 901.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Questions do not relate to the actual changes implemented; Argumentative; Lacks foundation; Hearsay.
321:22-322:2	611.	Argumentative.
355:1-6	401, 402, 602, 901.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Lacks foundation.

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
381:13-15; 382:15-17	701, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to provide legal conclusions; Calls for opinion; Hearsay.
382:3-5	611.	Misstates testimony.
389:14-18	611, 701, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to the actual changes implemented; Calls for speculation; Argumentative; Hearsay.
390:2-4; 395:10-13	602, 801, 802, 901.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Questions do not relate to the actual changes implemented; Lacks foundation; Calls for Speculation; Hearsay.
390:9-11	602, 611, 801, 802, 901.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to the actual changes implemented; Lacks foundation; Assumes facts not in evidence; Hearsay.
391:1-2	611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Question does not relate to the actual changes implemented; Vague and ambiguous as to "that"; Misstates testimony; Hearsay.
391:6-9; 391:21-392:2	611, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Questions do not relate to the actual changes implemented; Misstates document; Hearsay.
396:21-397:5; 397:7-8; 398:5-6; 399:13-14	401, 402, 407.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Subsequent remedial measures.
401:12-18	602, 611, 701.	Calls for speculation; Incomplete hypothetical.
405:22-406:2; 406:4-6; 407:10-14	401, 402, 602, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Questions do not relate to the actual changes implemented; Hearsay.

Case 3:09-cv-00620-REP Document 910 Filed 02/20/12 Page 18 of 37 PageID# 29670

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
407:17-19	401, 402, 602, 801, 802, 901.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to potential financial effects of potential changes; Lacks foundation; Hearsay.
416:22-417:2	401, 402, 602, 611, 801, 802.	Irrelevant in light of <i>TiVo</i> ; Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Witness is not designated to provide legal conclusions; Misstates document; Hearsay.
436:20-22; 437:5; 438:2-4; 439:9-13; 438:21-22	602, 801, 802, 901.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation; Questions do not relate to the actual changes implemented; Witness lacks knowledge of the document; Hearsay.

Mr. Hager is expected to be present and available at the hearing. At the time of the deposition from which plaintiff has designated, Mr. Hager was not a witness within the scope of Fed. R. Civ. P. 32(a)(3). Because he will be a present and available witness, his deposition testimony cannot be introduced into evidence.

In the alternative, and should the Court determine that designated portions of the deposition may be offered into evidence, Lawson Software, Inc. makes the following objections.

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
27:2 – 27:6	403, 611.	Asked and answered.
27:7 – 27:16; 27:19		Relevance; Foundation; Improper attempt to
- 28:5	401, 402, 602, 612.	refresh recollection.
		Vague and ambiguous as to "involved in the
30:14 - 30:17	401, 402.	transition." Argumentative.
		Witness's recollection of statement is irrelevant;
24.4.24.6	401 402 1002	Video, which was produced, is itself the best
34:4 - 34:6	401, 402, 1002.	evidence.
		Vague and ambiguous as to "functional changes." Information is outside witness's
44:9 - 44:11	401, 402, 602.	personal knowledge.
55:6 - 55:15; 55:17,	401, 402, 002.	personal knowledge.
55:22 -56:8, 56:11 -		Relevance; Vague and ambiguous as to "right";
14	401, 402, 611, 613.	Badgering; Improper use of prior statement.
60:2 – 22; 61:3;	. , . , . ,	3, F.
61:16 – 64:12	401, 402, 612.	Relevance; Improper refreshment of recollection.
68:2; 68:6 - 69:7;		
69:11; 71:5 - 71:7;	401 402 402 611	
71:12 - 71:13	401, 402, 403, 611.	Argumentative; Asked and answered; relevance.
77:13-22	401, 402, 801, 802.	Relevance; Hearsay.
	- ,,,,	
78:17-20	611, 801, 802.	Foundation; Hearsay.
79:20 - 79:21; 80:2 -		
80:12; 80:16 - 81:1;		
81:3 - 81:9; 81:16 -		
81:20; 81:22; 82:21 -		Witness has no recollection of these documents
83:6; 84:20 - 85:3;	602, 611, 801, 802,	and is not a recipient or author; Lack of
85:9 - 86:6	901.	foundation.
01.6.01.10	C11	Misstates the testimony as to replacement cost
91:6 - 91:10	611.	and time; Argumentative.

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
		Misstates the testimony as to context of
02 10 02 15	C11	statements made at injunction hearing;
92:10 - 92:15	611.	Argumentative: Argumentative; Vague and ambiguous as to "that
92:21 - 93:1	401, 402, 611.	testimony."
93:6 - 93:9	401, 402, 611.	Argumentative; Vague and ambiguous as to "the answer that you provided to the Court that day."
98:19 – 99:15	602, 801, 802.	Foundation; Hearsay.
99:13 - 99:15	611.	Argumentative; Vague and ambiguous as to "by May 31, 2011"; Misstates the document as to what the document "contemplat[ed]."
104:3 - 104:8; 104:14-104:19;		Entire line of questioning as to whether the witness informed the court of redesign after the injunction hearing is irrelevant as to whether the products are more than colorably different or whether there is continuing infringement;
105:7 - 105:8	401, 402, 403, 611.	Argumentative; Asked and answered.
105:13 - 105:18	401, 402, 611.	Entire line of questioning as to whether the witness informed the court of redesign after the injunction hearing is irrelevant as to whether the products are more than colorably different or whether there is continuing infringement; Argumentativ;. Vague and ambiguous as to "any efforts."
106:13 – 106:19	401, 402.	Relevance
116:13 - 116:17	401, 402.	Misstates the testimony as to the extent the witness relied on communication with Lohkamp; Vague and ambiguous as to "that."
110.15 110.17	.01, 102.	, agas and amorgaous as to that.
118:12-19	801, 802.	Hearsay
118:20 - 118:22	401, 402, 403, 611.	Misstates the testimony as to extent the witness relied on communication with Lohkamp. Vague and ambiguous as to "your testimony"; Asked and answered.
120:3 - 120:5	611.	Improper form; Misstates the document as to whether Lohkamp was "asked to make a guess."

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
-		Improper form; Misstates the document as to
		whether the question was "I know it's a guess";
120:9	403, 611.	The question preceded the statement;
120.9	403, 011.	Argumentative; Asked and answered. Misstates the testimony as to the extent the
		witness relied on communication with Lohkamp;
		Misstates the document as to whether a guess
		was requested; Vague and ambiguous as to "your
120.12 120.14	402 (11	testimony"; Argumentative; Asked and
120:12 - 120:14	403, 611.	answered. Improper form; Misstates the document as to
		what was asked of Lohkamp; Argumentative;
120:22 - 121:3	403, 611.	Asked and answered.
	,	
130:20 – 131:5	611.	Improper form; Argumentative.
121.12 10	402 611	Improper form; Argumentative; Asked and
131:12-19	403, 611.	answered. Improper form; Argumentative; Asked and
132:3-8	403, 611.	answered.
132.3 0	103, 011.	Entire line of questioning as to whether the
		witness informed the court of redesign after the
		injunction hearing is irrelevant as to whether the
		products are more than colorably different or
133:3 - 133:4	401, 402, 403, 611.	whether there is continuing infringement. Argumentative; Asked and answered.
134:1 - 134:4	611.	Improper form; Argumentative.
146:11 – 13, 17, 22	403, 611.	Asked and answered.
, ,	,	Improper form; Misstates the testimony as to
		what was communicated to customers; Asked
147:21 - 148:2	403, 611.	and answered.
170:4 - 170:5	401, 402, 611.	Improper form; Argumentative; Relevance.
185:6 - 185:7	401, 402, 611.	Improper form; Argumentative; Relevance.
185:20 - 185:21	401, 402, 611.	Argumentative; Relevance.
188:3 - 188:4; 188:7	(02, 001	Witness has no recollection of this document and
- 188:9	602, 901.	is not a recipient or author; Lack of foundation. Witness has no recollection of this document and
		is not a recipient or author; Lack of foundation;
		Hearsay as to whether "Dean's testimony was
		based on " Misstates evidence as to where
188:17 - 190:11	602, 901, 801.	Keith Lohkamp gave a "guess."
101.01.102.15	600 611 001	Witness has no recollection of this document and
191:21 - 192:12	602, 611, 901.	is not a recipient or author; Lack of foundation.

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
193:17-20	602, 611.	Foundation; Improper form; Argumentative.
194:15 - 194:18	602, 611.	Foundation; Improper form; Argumentative.
	,	Improper form; Argumentative; Misstates the
206:12 - 206:16	611.	document as referencing RQ instead of RQC.
208:7 - 208:9	611.	Improper form; Argumentative.
212:9 - 212:13	602, 901.	Counsel identifies an email on which witness is a recipient and proceeds to ask only about emails on which he is not a recipient without so clarifying; Lack of foundation.
213:19 - 214:6; 214:18 - 214:22; 216:5-6	602, 801, 802, 901.	Witness has no knowledge of emails inquired about, of which he is neither an author nor recipient; Lacks foundation; hearsay; Vague and ambiguous as to product being discussed.
		•
219:3-5	611.	Improper form; Argumentative.
245:5-7	611.	Argumentative.
250:16 - 251:8; 251:10 - 252:2;	401 402	n 1
252:4 - 252:9	401, 402.	Relevance. This portion of the email has been clawed back
		for redaction as privileged pursuant to the
260:21 - 261:9	502, 602.	Protective Order.
278:17 – 279:9	401, 402, 611.	Relevance; Argumentative.
282:11-16	602, 611.	Foundation; Argumentative.
202.11 10	002, 011.	Calls for a legal conclusion; Foundation;
286:4 - 286:7	401, 402, 602, 611.	Argumentative.
291:8 - 292:2; 292:9		Witness has no knowledge of these
- 292:15; 293:1 -	(02, 001	statements/this document and was neither an
294:5	602, 901.	author nor a recipient. Lacks foundation. Foundation; for speculation as to why J. Langer
322:14	602.	was making a certain recommendation.
323:12-14; 323:18-		5
21	602.	Foundation
		Entire line of questioning as to statements at the
		injunction hearing is irrelevant as to whether the
		products are more than colorably different or whether there is continuing infringement;
		Argumentative; Asked and answered; Misstates
		the evidence as to what "your support team was
324:7 - 324:11	401, 402, 403, 611.	telling you" regarding availability to be shipped.

Case 3:09-cv-00620-REP Document 910 Filed 02/20/12 Page 23 of 37 PageID# 29675

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
		Improper form; Argumentatative; Misstates the
		evidence as to whether witness "suggest[ed]"
329:10 - 329:13	401, 402, 611.	anything; Relevance.
		Argumentative; Misstates the evidence as to
330:8 - 330:10	611.	"suggesting."
331:14-16	611.	Improper form; Argumentative
		Vague and ambiguous as to which email is being
		referenced. Misstates the evidence as to several
333:20	401, 402.	emails on the chain.
		Improper form; Argumentative; Vague and
		ambiguous as to product and as to functionality;
340:21 - 341:1	401, 402, 611.	Relevance.
341:18 - 341:21	401, 402, 611.	Improper form; Argumentative; Relevance.
		Vague and ambiguous as to "your counsel's
373:19 - 373:21	401, 402, 611.	questions."
		Improper form; Argumentative; Misstates the
		evidence as to why witness was chosen to testify
374:8 - 374:13	401, 402, 611.	and about what; Relevance.
		Foundation; Misstates evidence as to what
		witness did to educate himself and as to product;
375:21 - 376:4	602, 611.	Argumentative.
		Improper form; Argumentative; Misstates the
		evidence as to knowledge of when product
376:16 - 376:20	403, 602, 611.	would be "available"; Asked and answered.

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated Testimony		
52:14 – 52:17	401, 402.	Objection to form; Compound
52:22	401, 402, 611.	Objection to form; Argumentative; Vague
		and ambiguous.
53:5 – 53:6	401, 402.	Objection to form; Compound.
53:12 - 53:15	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Objection to form; Argumentative;
		Foundation; Outside scope of 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		discuss customer communications; Hearsay.
64:9 – 64:10	401, 402, 403; 602; 801, 802.	Objection to form; Calls for speculation;
		Outside scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Witness was not designated to testify as to
		RQC installations performed by its
51.50		customers; Hearsay.
64:20 – 64:21	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Objection to form; Calls for speculation;
		Outside scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Witness was not designated to testify as to
((2) ((7	401 402 602 901 902	customers that have licensed RSS; Hearsay.
66:2 – 66:7	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Objection to form; Compound; Calls for
		speculation; Outside scope of 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to customer status regarding RSS or RQC; Hearsay.
67:3 – 67:5	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Objection to form; Calls for speculation;
		Outside scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Witness was not designated to testify as to
		customer status regarding RSS or RQC;
		Hearsay.
67:13	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Objection to form; Calls for speculation;
		Outside scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Hearsay.
69:17 – 69:18;	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Vague and ambiguous as to "operational."
69:21		Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
71.5.71.7	401 402	testify as to technical definitions; Hearsay.
71:5 – 71:7	401, 402.	Objection to form; Vague and ambiguous as
76.20 77.1	401 402 602	to "prior configuration."
76:20 – 77:1	401, 402, 602.	Objection to form; Foundation; Vague and
		ambiguous as to "clients for whom you have
		provided assistance."

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated Testimony		
80:13 - 80:15; 81:2 - 81:3; 81:9; 82:13 - 82:15	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Compound; Calls for speculation; Misstates the testimony; Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to product differences; Hearsay.
85:6 – 85:8; 86:6 -86:8; 87:12 – 87:13	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Misstates the testimony; Argumentative; Asked and answered; Calls for speculation; Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to product comparative functionality; Hearsay.
88:13 – 88:14	611.	Argumentative; Misstates the testimony.
89:16 – 89:18	401, 402, 403; 602; 801, 802.	Argumentative; Asked and answered; Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to product comparative functionality; Hearsay.
91:9 – 91:10;	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Calls for speculation; Outside the scope of
91:18 – 91:20		the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to customer support issues; Hearsay.
101:8 – 101:10	401, 402, 901.	Exhibit lacks foundation (no Bates label; no indication that document without Bates label was attachment to email).
102:2 - 102:4	602, 901.	Exhibit lacks foundation.
104:20 - 104:22	401, 402, 602, 901.	Exhibit lacks foundation.
106:7 – 106:10	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Improper form; Compound; Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to customer communications; Hearsay.
107:13 – 107:14	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to product comparative functionality; Hearsay.
114:3 – 114:4	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to configuration; Hearsay.
115:12 – 115:15	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to configuration; Hearsay.
124:8 – 124:11	401, 402.	Misstates the exhibit ("client's end users shouldn't need to be trained" vs. "no training issues have been identified to date").

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated Testimony		
127:16 – 127:17	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to customer downloads of RQC;
120.10	401 402	Hearsay.
128:18	401, 402.	Why Lawson does not maintain records of customer installations of RQC is not
		relevant.
129:21 - 130:2	401, 402, 611.	Argumentative.
130:10	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Who would know the answer to the question
		is irrelevant; Foundation; Outside the scope
		of the 30(b)(6) designation; Hearsay.
137:4 – 137:8	401, 402.	Objection to form. Compound
137:14 – 137:15	401, 402, 602.	Relevance; Foundation.
142:16; 143:16 –	401, 402, 611.	Argumentative.
17	(11	
147:19 – 147:22	611.	Improper form; Argumentative; Compound.
148:5 – 148:6	401, 402, 403.	Vague and ambiguous as to "operational"; Asked and answered.
150:13 – 150:15	401, 402, 403.	Asked and answered. Asked and answered.
156:10 – 156:13	401, 402, 403, 611.	Improper form; Argumentative; Misstates the
130.10 130.13	401, 402, 403, 011.	testimony.
158:18 – 158:20,	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
159:9-12		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify about provision of upgrades to
		customers; Hearsay.
161:13 – 161:16	401, 402, 602.	How a customer is conducting its
		procurement activities is not relevant;
160.1 160.2	401 402 602	Foundation.
162:1 – 162:3	401, 402, 602.	Whether a customer has ceased conducting procurement activities using Lawson systems
		is not relevant; Foundation; Relevance.
162:17 – 162:21	401, 402, 602, 801, 802	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	designation; Hearsay.
163:18 – 163:20	401, 402, 403.	Asked and answered.
164:3	401, 402, 611.	Argumentative.
164:9 – 164:11	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Asked and answered Outside the scope of
		the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not
160 10 160 16	401 402 602 001 002	designated to testify as to configuration.
169:13 – 169:16	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Argumentative; Outside the scope of the
		30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not
		designated on stated customer communication issue; Hearsay.
		communication issue, Hearsay.

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated		·
Testimony		
170:4 - 170:7	401, 402, 602; 801, 802.	Argumentative; Outside the scope of the
		30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not
		designated on stated customer
		communication issue; Hearsay.
173:2 – 173:3	401, 402.	Argumentative; Objection to form.
173:8 – 173:9	401, 402, 403, 602; 801, 802.	Asked and answered; Outside the scope of
		the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not
		designated on stated customer
		communication issue; Hearsay.
173:16 – 173:17	401, 402, 403, 602; 801, 802.	Asked and answered; Outside the scope of
		the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not
		designated on stated customer
		communication issue; Hearsay.
175:14 – 175:17	401, 402, 403, 602; 801, 802.	Calls for a legal conclusion; Outside the
		scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness
		was not designated to testify as to the
		injunction; Hearsay.
176:1 – 176:4	401, 402, 403, 602; 801, 802.	Objection to form; Calls for a legal
		conclusion; Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to the injunction; Hearsay.
176:11 – 176:14	401, 402, 403, 602; 801, 802.	Objection to form. Outside the scope of the
		30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not
		designated to testify to configuration;
		Hearsay.
179:20 – 179:22	401, 402, 403.	Asked and answered.
181:5 – 181:7	401, 402, 403.	Asked and answered.
188:6 – 188:9;	401, 402, 403, 602; 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
188:11 – 188:12;		designation; Witness was not designated to
188:14 – 188:16		testify about the identity of customers that
		have installed and/or implemented RQC or
		customers that have removed and/or
1061 1062	401 402 402 602 001 602	uninstalled RSS; Hearsay.
196:1 – 196:3	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802;	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not
	901.	involved with the support team). Calls for
		speculation. Incomplete exhibit. Outside the
		scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness
		was not designated to testify as to customer
		support issues; Hearsay.

Plaintiff's Designated	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Testimony		
197:5 – 197:6	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802; 901.	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not involved with the support team). Calls for speculation. Incomplete exhibit. Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to customer support issues; Hearsay.
200:13 – 200:14	401, 402, 403, 602; 801, 802; 901.	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not involved with the support team). Calls for speculation. Incomplete exhibit. Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to customer support issues, Hearsay.
200:22 – 201:2	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802; 901.	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not involved with the support team). Calls for speculation. Incomplete exhibit. Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to customer support issues; Hearsay.
202:7 – 202:9	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802; 901.	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not involved with the support team). Calls for speculation. Incomplete exhibit. Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to customer support issues; Hearsay.
203:19 – 203:21	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802; 901.	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not involved with the support team); Calls for speculation. Incomplete exhibit; Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to customer support issues; Hearsay.
204:18 – 205:1	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802; 901.	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not involved with the support team); Calls for speculation. Incomplete exhibit; Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to customer support issues; Hearsay.
205:14 – 205:15	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Asked and answered; Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to running RQC and RSS in parallel; Hearsay.

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated Testimony	Č	
206:2 – 206:3;	401, 402; 403, 602, 801, 802;	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not
206:6	901.	involved with the support team); Calls for
		speculation. Incomplete exhibit; Outside the
		scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness
		was not designated to testify as to customer
		support issues; Hearsay.
206:22 – 207:22;	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802;	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not
208:7	901.	involved with the support team); Calls for
		speculation; Incomplete exhibit; Outside the
		scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness
		was not designated to testify as to running
208:16 – 208:18	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802;	RQC and RSS in parallel; Hearsay. Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not
200.10 - 200.10	901.	involved with the support team); Calls for
		speculation. Incomplete exhibit; Outside the
		scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness
		was not designated to testify as to running
		RQC and RSS in parallel; Hearsay.
209:19 – 209:21	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802;	Exhibit lacks foundation (Mr. Hanson is not
	901.	involved with the support team); Calls for
		speculation; Incomplete exhibit; Outside the
		scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness
		was not designated to testify as to running
212:12 – 212:14	401, 402, 403, 611.	RQC and RSS in parallel; Hearsay. Asked and answered; Relevance.
213:17 – 213:21	401, 402, 403, 611.	Asked and answered; Relevance. Asked and answered; Argumentative;
213.17 213.21	401, 402, 403, 011.	Relevance.
218:11	401, 402, 403, 611.	Asked and answered; Argumentative.
218:22 - 219:2	401, 402, 403, 611.	Argumentative; Misstates the exhibits.
219:7 - 219:8	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to running RQC and RSS in
		parallel; Hearsay.
220:20 – 220:22	401, 402, 403.	Objection to form. Compound.
221:5 – 221:6	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Objection to form; Outside the scope of the
221.16 221.10	401 402 402 611	30(b)(6) designation; Hearsay.
221:16 – 221:18	401, 402, 403, 611.	Objection to form; Argumentative.
253:1 – 253:9	401, 402, 403, 602; 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to customer support; Hearsay.
253:19 – 254:3;	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
254:16 – 254:17		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to configuration; Hearsay.
•		

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated		
Testimony		
255:5 – 255:7	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Misstates the testimony; Outside the scope of
		the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not
		designated to testify as to configuration;
		Hearsay.
270:9 – 270:11	401, 402, 403.	Calls for speculation. Misstates the exhibit.
271:9 – 271:22	401, 402, 403.	Objection to form.
280:16 – 280:21	401, 402, 403.	Objection to form.
281:4 – 281:6	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to design of RQC; Hearsay.
283:19 - 283:20	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to design of RQC; Hearsay
285:18 – 285:19	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Objection to form; Outside the scope of the
		30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not
		designated to running RQC and RSS in
		parallel.
287:17	401, 402, 403, 602.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to design of RQC.
293:13 – 293:19	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		testify as to configuration; Hearsay.
300:17 – 300:19	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Objection to form; Asked and Answered;
		Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6)
		designation; Witness was not designated to
		running RQC and RSS in parallel; Hearsay.
313:8 – 313:13	401, 402, 403.	Asked and answered.
322:9 – 322:10	401, 402, 403.	Asked and answered. Misstates the
		testimony. See objection at 322:11-12.
334:3 – 334:4	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802,	Objection to form; Calls for opinion;
	701, 801, 802.	Foundations; Outside the scope of the
		30(b)(6) designation; Hearsay.
338:9 – 338:13	401, 402, 403, 602, 901.	Objection to form; Foundation.

Objections to Designations in December 21, 2011 Deposition of Elizabeth R. Homewood

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated		
Testimony		
17:3 – 17:4	401, 402, 611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "each of these topics"; Compound.
22:18 – 22:20	401, 402, 611.	Asked and answered; Misstates the
		testimony.
36:2 – 36:8	401, 402, 602.	Hypothetical; Assumes facts not in evidence; Foundation.
36:14 – 36:21	401, 402, 602.	Hypothetical; Assumes facts not in evidence; Foundation.
37:5 – 37:10	401, 402, 602.	Hypothetical; Assumes facts not in evidence; Foundation.
39:5 – 39:10	401, 402, 602.	Hypothetical; Assumes facts not in evidence; Foundation.
46:21 – 47:2	602; 901	Lacks foundation.
68:20 – 69:6	401, 402, 403	Improper form; Foundation as to subject email.
72:9 – 72:10	602, 801, 802	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to technical information.
78:1 – 78:6	401, 402, 602	Hypothetical; Assumes facts not in evidence; Foundation.
84:9 - 84:12	401, 402, 403, 602.	Foundation; Assumes facts not in evidence.
94:18 – 95:1	602, 901.	Foundation.
101:13 – 102:2	602, 801, 802, 901	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Foundation.
102:15 - 102:20	602 801, 802, 901.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Foundation.
103:4 – 103:20	602, 801, 802, 901.	Outside the scope of the 30(b)(6) designation; Foundation.
105:20 - 105:22	401, 402, 403.	Asked and answered.
106:5 – 106:7	401, 402, 403.	Asked and answered.
108:6 - 109:9	602, 611, 901.	Foundation; Improper form; Vague.
110:4 - 110:7	602, 901.	Foundation.
114:22 – 115:2;	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Relevance; Outside the scope of the
115:6		309(b)(6) designation; Witness was not designated to testify as to patches for RQC.
118:20 – 119:3	401, 402, 602.	Hypothetical; Assumes facts not in evidence; Foundation.
132:12 – 132:15	401, 402, 403	Asked and answered.

Objections to Designations in December 21, 2011 Deposition of Elizabeth R. Homewood

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated		
Testimony		
134:3 – 134:7	401, 402, 403, 602, 801, 802.	Asked and answered; Outside the scope of
		the 30(b)(6) designation; Witness was not
		designated to testify as to products use.
135:18 – 135:20	401, 402, 403, 611.	Compound; Asked and answered,
		Argumentative.
158:19 – 159:1	401, 402, 602, 611.	Foundation; Argumentative.
169:11 – 170:1	401, 402, 403.	Compound.
178:15 – 178:17	401, 402, 403.	Asked and answered.

LAWSON -- HOMEWOOD OBJECTIONS.DOCX

Objections to Designations in January 9, 2012 Deposition of Kurt Reasoner

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
53:20-21	401, 402, 602.	Foundation.
82:20-21	401, 402, 602.	Foundation.

Objections to Designations in January 5, 2012 Deposition of Kevin Samuelson

Plaintiff's	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Designated		
Testimony	602 001 002	020(1)(0) 1 : : :
84:6-85:2,	602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Hypothetical.
128:6-9	602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Hypothetical.
129:14-16	602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Hypothetical.
130:8-17	403, 602, 801, 802.	Asked and answered; Outside the scope of
		30(b)(6) designation; Hypothetical.
179:22 – 180:2	602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Hypothetical.
238:15 – 239:6,	401, 402, 611.	Incomplete question.
240:10-18		
243:11-20	401, 402, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Hypothetical.
248:5-17	401, 402, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Hypothetical.
255:6-13	401, 402, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Hypothetical.
263:3-5	401, 402, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Foundation; Hypothetical.
302:22 - 303:7	401, 402, 602	Foundation.
334:6-9	602.	Foundation.
343:9-13	401, 402, 602, 801, 802.	Outside the scope of 30(b)(6) designation;
		Foundation; Hypothetical.

Objections to Designations in January 6, 2012 Deposition of Keith Lohkamp

Mr. Lohkamp is expected to be present and available at the hearing. At the time of the deposition from which plaintiff has designated, Mr. Lohkamp was not a witness within the scope of Fed. R. Civ. P. 32(a)(3). Because he will be a present and available witness, his deposition testimony cannot be introduced into evidence.

In the alternative, and should the Court determine that designated portions of the deposition may be offered into evidence, Lawson Software, Inc. makes the following objections.

Plaintiff's		Y • • • •
Designated	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Testimony 27.5 and 16.22		
37:5-9; 38:16-22;		
39:22-40:3; 70:7-8;		Inappropriate expert testimony; Lacks
173:3	602, 701.	personal knowledge.
40:15-17	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "related to items that you can purchase from multiple different
		vendors".
41:14-18; 50:8-10;	401, 402.	
51:5-6; 51:10-12;		
53:6-12; 53:19-22;		
54:9; 54:11-12;		
55:6-9; 57:14-16;		
57:19-21; 58:2-3;		
58:5-8; 58:11-13;		
59:6-8; 65:21-22;		
114:12-15		Irrelevant in light of Tivo.
45:6-8; 46:10-11;	602.	
79:2-5; 103:9-14;		
105:20-106:1;		
106:11-13; 112:19-		
22; 114:17-19;		
121:6-7; 137:8-10;		
137:13-15; 144:22-		
145:2; 156:15-17;		
157:1-3; 157:8;		
157:10-11; 168:5-7;		
175:22-176:19;		
180:13-14; 181:7-10;		
187:5-6; 193:21-22;		
1194:5-9; 196:11-15;		
200:1-3; 201:11-13;		
207:13-16; 213:10-		
15; 213:22-214:2;		
215:13-15; 216:2-3		Lacks personal knowledge; Speculation.

Objections to Designations in January 6, 2012 Deposition of Keith Lohkamp

Plaintiff's Designated	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
Testimony		· ·
50:1-2	401, 402, 602, 611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "agreed with that conclusion"; Lacks personal knowledge;
		Irrelevant in light of Tivo.
71:16-19; 72:3-7	611.	Misstates testimony.
73:16-21	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "items are returned back to the Lawson system to that right hand side of the user interface of RQC".
74:5-15	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "brought those items back into the right hand side screen"; Incomplete hypothetical.
75:2-8	611.	
		Incomplete hypothetical.
79:12-13; 80:18-21;	602, 611.	
177:7-10		Lacks personal knowledge; Argumentative.
90:15-19	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "multiple items for inclusion in a requisition that can be purchased from multiple different vendors".
93:4-14; 94:21-95:1	407, 602, 701.	Inappropriate expert testimony; Lacks personal knowledge; Subsequent remedial measures.
94:1-5	407.	Subsequent remedial measures.
98:4-7; 189:8-11	801, 802.	Hearsay.
100:12-13	407, 602, 801, 802.	Lacks personal knowledge; Speculation; Subsequent remedial measures; Hearsay.
102:20-103:2	611.	Misstates testimony.
111:18-19	611.	Vague and ambiguous as to "work had already begun".
112:13-14; 115:1-4	602.	
		Lacks personal knowledge; Speculation; Lacks foundation.
113:6-9	611.	
		Argumentative.
122:4-7	602, 701.	Lacks personal knowledge; Speculation; Inappropriate expert testimony.

Case 3:09-cv-00620-REP Document 910 Filed 02/20/12 Page 37 of 37 PageID# 29689

Objections to Designations in January 6, 2012 Deposition of Keith Lohkamp

Plaintiff's Designated Testimony	Lawson's Objections	Lawson's Summary
122:14-17	602, 611, 701.	Lacks personal knowledge; Speculation; Inappropriate expert testimony; Argumentative.
130:5-6	602, 611, 701.	Vague and ambiguous as to "configuration"; Inappropriate expert testimony; Lacks personal knowledge; Speculation.
130:5-7; 131:16-18	602, 701.	Inappropriate expert testimony; Lacks personal knowledge; Speculation.
170:22-171:6; 171:11-13	602.	Lacks personal knowledge of document.
179:10-17	602, 611.	Misstates document; Lacks personal knowledge; Speculation.
180:7-9	602, 611, 701.	Inappropriate expert testimony; Lacks personal knowledge; Speculation; Argumentative.